



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/022,359	12/20/2001	Roderick L. Roma	088305-0138	3441

22428 7590 03/07/2005

FOLEY AND LARDNER  
SUITE 500  
3000 K STREET NW  
WASHINGTON, DC 20007

EXAMINER

PARDO, THUY N

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2165

DATE MAILED: 03/07/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Application No.

10/022,359

Applicant(s)

ROMA ET AL.

Examiner

Thuy Pardo

Art Unit

2165

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2004.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-45 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_.  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_.  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Applicant's Amendment filed on November 12, 2004 in response to Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed.

2. Claims 1-45 are presented for examination.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-45 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Dusevic et al. (Hereinafter "Dusevic") U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0055868, in view of Leisten et al. (Hereinafter "Leisten") US Patent No. 6,023,702.

As to claim 1, Dusevic teaches the invention substantially as claimed, comprising:  
receiving an identification of a first customer [inherent in the system in order to allow the user to conduct transactions over the network, see fig. 1; 0037-0038 of page 3];  
identifying one or more applications accessible to the first customer [tasks 110 of fig. 2; 0051 of pages 4-5];

receiving a selection of a first application from the one or more applications to execute [0057 of page 5]; and executing one or more generic tasks stored in a first area accessible to all customers and executing at least one customized task, the at least one customized task being stored in a second area accessible only to the first customer [0057 of page 5; 0065-0067 of page 6].

However, Dusevic does not explicitly teach identifying one or more rules applicable to the application. Leisten teaches enforcing over-all rules for each specific role of a specific project [see the abstract].

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to add the feature of Leisten to the system of Dusevic as an essential means to conduct tasks which must be done within the maximum logical permission and schedules requested for the project.

As to claim 2, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches receiving an identification of a second customer different from the first customer [inherent having this feature because each customer has his own id in order to access to the network]; identifying one or more applications accessible to the second customer [0073-0074 of pages 6-7]; receiving a selection of a second applications accessible to the second application from the one or more customer to execute [create project item, 0074 of page 7]; executing one or more generic tasks stored in the first area accessible to all customers according to the identified one or more rules applicable to the second application and, the at least one customized task being stored in a third area accessible only to the second customer [fig. 2-3; 0050-0057 of pages 4-5].

Art Unit: 2165

Leisten further teaches identifying one or more rules applicable to the second application and executing at least one customized task according to the identified one or more rules applicable to the second application [ab].

As to claim 3, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches that at least one of the generic tasks executed for the first application is executed for the second application [task and subtask, fig. 2].

As to claim 4, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches that at least one of the rules applicable to the first application is applicable to the second application [task and subtask, fig. 2].

As to claim 5, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches receiving a request to modify the first generic application into a first custom application, generating at least one customized task based upon the received request, and modifying at least one of the one or more identified rules to incorporate the at least one customized task into the first custom application, the first custom application including at least one of the one or more generic tasks included in the first generic application [see fig. 14].

As to claim 6, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches that the request includes details about tasks to include in the first custom application, and the at least one customized task is generated according to the details [fig. 14].

As to claim 7, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches that the generating the at least one customized task includes modifying at least one of the one or more generic tasks to generate the at least one customized task [fig. 2, 3, 14].

As to claim 8, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches that the at least one customized task is a new task different from the identified one or more generic tasks [fig. 14; 0345-0350 of pages 14-15].

As to claim 10, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches that storing the at least on customized task of the first custom application in a location in memory that is only accessible to the first customer [0338 of page 14].

As to claim 13, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches storing the at least on customized task of the second custom application in a location in memory that is only accessible to the second customer [0338 of page 14].

As to claim 14, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches that the first and second generic applications are the same [a plurality of tasks 110 of fig. 2; 0051 of page 4].

Art Unit: 2165

As to claim 15, Dusevic and Leisten teach the invention substantially as claimed. Dusevic further teaches that the first and second generic application are different [subtask 112A and subtask 112B of fig. 2].

As to claims 9, 11, 12, 16-45, all limitations of these claims have been addressed in the analysis above, and these claims are rejected on that basis.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant argues that Dusevic fails to disclose executing generic tasks accessible to all customers and executing at least one customized task accessible only to a first customer.

As to point this, Examiner respectfully disagrees. Examiner believes these features have been taught by Dusevic. Dusevic teaches macro tasks and individual tasks. Macro tasks are generic tasks which may display one or more user-selectable items being accessible to all customers [see 0076 and 0009] and the task-centric online environment provides a portion as a personal binder (or individual task) that enables access to information that is customized by and targeted to each user [0012].

5. Applicant's arguments filed on November 12, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

### ***Conclusion***

Art Unit: 2165

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thuy Pardo, whose telephone number is 571-272-4082. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday from 8:30 AM to 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dov Popovici, can be reached at 571-272-4083.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows: (703) 872-9306 (Official Communication)

and/or:

571-273-4082 (*Use this Fax#, only after approval by Examiner, for "INFORMAL" or "Draft" communication. Examiner may request that a formal/amendment be faxed directly to then on occasions*).





Any inquiry of a general nature of relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

**1. Any response to this final action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Washington, D.C. 20231

**or faxed to:** (703) 308-9051, (for formal communications intended for entry)

**Or:** (703) 308-5359, (for informal or draft communications, please label "PROPOSED" or "DRAFT")

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA. Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

March 01, 2005

**THUY N. PARDO**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**